THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. DECEMBER, 1941. Vol. XXXI

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Christianity, Secularism, and Reconstruction.

In a lecture[1] on the contribution of the Churches to the reconstruction of European life, delivered by His Excellency Professor Dr. P. S. Gerbrandy, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, at Oxford on October 24th, 1941, the audience heard a professing Christian, a practical politician, an eminent student of European social evolution, maintain that the Christian religion, by its faith, its scriptures, and its institutions, has an indispensable contribution to make to world reconstruction. Such a statement is in harmony with the convictions of a growing number of directing personalities, not only in British and American life, but also in China and in many of the smaller European states.

The Dutch Prime Minister's conviction, however, is far from being that of the leaders of the U.S.S.R. This is clearly indicated in the following letter published in *The Spectator* of October 25th:

> Sir,—'Russia has some way to go towards religious freedom yet' (first page of *The Spectator* of October 10th, 1941). The Christian religion has been for far more than a thousand years maintained by persecution of dissentients, by 'wars of religion,' hangings, disembowel-

[1] *The Contribution of the Churches to the Reconstruction of European Life.* By His Excellency Professor Dr. P. S. Gerbrandy, Prime Minister of the Netherlands. (S.C.M. Press, 1941. Price 6*d.*)

lings and burnings. According as one body of Christians or another has had the upper hand, the faith has been 'kept pure' by these means. No one acquainted with the facts of Christian history can possibly deny this. It has had another accomplice—obscurantism. Not only that of ignorance (even as lately as some forty years ago, I think, only sixteen in a hundred people in Spain could read and write), but that which consisted in deliberately circumventing the invention of printing by an *index expurgatorius,* so that even educated people to-day seriously tell us, 'I may read so and so' and 'I may not read so and so.'

Russia has proposed to itself to let people believe and worship as they like, but to keep propaganda in its own hands. It does not propose to keep enlightenment away, it proposes to supply enlightenment. (The question is not as to whether the enlightenment is 'darkness'; the question always is, or should be, whether obscurantism is enlightenment.) Now President Roosevelt has most emphatically said—and all the reconstructionists copy his words—that there must be 'freedom of thought and freedom of expression'; but since all thought is free, it is the latter only which States have to secure for us. Will you help to show that there is some goodwill among us to this end by letting your readers *audire alteram partem?*

There is a call now to religion, especially 'to go back' to religion; people like myself might be very interested to know which religious age we are invited to return to—with, of course, the social, educational, and economic conditions that are seen to have been compatible with it.

As a secular review of the highest possible reputation, will you help to prove that freedom, like peace, is indivisible by publishing my criticism? For I believe that this sort of freedom, freedom of expression in religious matters through the national vehicles of publicity, has not in fact any existence at all.—Yours, &c., M. A. R. TUKER.

[According to the Soviet Constitution, as quoted by M. Maisky in a speech in London on September 26th, Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution reads: 'Freedom of religious worship and *freedom of anti-religious propaganda* is recognized for all citizens.'—ED., *The Spectator.*]

This conflict of religious and anti-religious ideals is serious. The Russian ideal is as definitely secularist as the British and American ideal is Christian. The reason for the difference is clear. The U.S.S.R. views the Christian religion as the enemy of an enlightened, scientific and progressive civilization. The English and American leaders view the Christian religion as a *conditio sine qua non* of such a civilization.

This difference of valuation is due to the fact that the most influential Christians in Great Britain and the U.S.A. have demonstrated that the Christian religion can be a most resolute opponent of intolerance, obscurantism and tyranny in Church and State, whereas the Russian experience has been that the Christian Church when possessed of power has opposed freedom and enlightenment. Is there any remedy for such a situation?

We believe that there is: but we doubt if the remedy will prove palatable to either party.

First we would plead, in the name of Freedom, that the U.S.S.R. should place religion and secularism on an equality. At present this equality is not conceded. In Russia, freedom is given for religious worship and religious belief, but no freedom is given for religious propaganda; whereas secularism is given freedom and every encouragement by the State to propagate itself, especially among the young. In Freedom's name, religion and secularism in the U.S.S.R. ought to be put on a level and be given equal privileges. At present the Bolshevik idea of religious freedom is as one-sided as was that of Oliver Cromwell. The Protector declared that he was for religious toleration, but he added:

> 'If by that you mean I will tolerate the Mass, I tell you Nay.'

To deprive the Christian religion of the right to propagate itself publicly is a most insidious form of religious persecution.

Secondly, we would point out that neither in the British Empire nor in the United States of America is there as much encouragement given to enlightened Christian teaching as ought to be the case. There is an alarming amount of religious obscurantism in these countries which is viewed with complacency and even indulgence by their political, social, and religious leaders—an attitude which suggests that at heart they agree with Gibbon's famous dictum that for the philosopher all religions are equally false, for the multitude all are equally true, and for the magistrate all are equally useful. Were it otherwise, our leaders could hardly be so indifferent to the quality of the teaching given in the name of the Christian religion.

If it be true according to Gresham's Law that bad currency drives good currency out of circulation, this is equally true in the sphere of religion. The propagation of obscurantist Christian teaching is the deadliest foe to Christian truth. The situation thus created is well exemplified in the following citation from Professor John Macmurray's recently published *A Challenge to the Churches*:

> 'To the majority of progressive folk Christianity seems the enemy of progress and the bulwark of reaction. To large numbers of sensitive and intelligent young people Christianity seems not merely stupid and irrelevant, but also insincere and immoral. Clearly without a revolu-

> tionary change in the religious field the unconscious Christianity which underlies European civilization is not likely to provide a common bond of sentiment which can carry the superstructure of an international democracy. The fate of democracy after the war depends upon the Christian religion, upon its vitality and its power for creative transformation.'

Yet how unjust and how cowardly in the eyes of the Russians must seem to be the policy of Britain and America in the cause of truth, whether that truth be in the form of religion or anti-religion. The spirit of the U.S.S.R. is that of Elijah :

> 'If the Lord be God, follow him ; but if Baal, then follow him.'

The issue of true Christianity *versus* false Christianity is facing this counry to-day in the growing public demand for Christian education as an integral part of our nation's educational system. Are we going to allow this Christian education to be obscurantist, schismatic, unpractical, and ultimately incredible for the majority of our educated classes, or are we going to have the courage to make that Christian education what it ought to be?

We have a tyrannical and fanatical secularism in the U.S.S.R. and an obscurantist and schismatic Christianity in Great Britain and the U.S.A.. The desirable synthesis for both is a fearlessly truthful, entirely free, and wholly disinterested Christianity seeking only the welfare of humanity. But when we survey the so-called Christian world, where can we find the forces which are to secure this higher synthesis? They ought to be found pre-eminently in the inspiration and policy of the leaders of the Christian Churches.

Ecclesia Discens et Docens.

The *Guardian* of October 3 in a leading article entitled *Clerus Anglicanus Stupor Mundi* does not extol the English clergyman as the wonder of the world for his learning, but deplores the falling standard of scholarship among the clergy of to-day. There is good reason for the *Guardian's* tears. The number of learned English clergy is much smaller than it was forty years ago, and threatens to diminish still further. The *Guardian* gives many reasons for this diminution. The abolition of clerical Fellowships in the ancient universities, so that nowadays often the only clerical Fellow in a college is the Chaplain, and he not very learned, has deprived the Church of many

scholarly clergymen. Other enemies of sound learning among the clergy are, according to the *Guardian*, multiplication of parochial services and parochial organisations and lowered clerical incomes.

To us there seem to be at least three other less obvious enemies to sound learning among the clergy.

(1) The decrease of classical and humane studies in our national systems of education. Clerical learning was for the most part based on such studies and developed from them. Where the schools and universities attended by our ordinands have not laid the foundation of these studies, characteristically clerical erudition cannot be developed in later clerical life. Bishop Westcott said to an ordinand that he would as soon think of travelling without his Greek Testament as without his toothbrush; but if a clergyman cannot read his Greek Testament readily, he will feel no need for it and consequently will have little interest in the important results of recent Greek Testament studies.

(2) Clerical learning used to be encouraged by ecclesiastical preferment. This is no longer the case, save in the strictly academic sphere. Deaneries and canonries were regarded for the most part as the lawful heritage of the learned. When we consult Crockford for 1941, we discover chapter after chapter without a single scholar of eminence. To-day, clerical promotion in these spheres, as in others, goes almost entirely to clerics possessed of practical gifts of organization and administration, pulpit eloquence, and pastoral influence. In an age of economics, when one of the marks of the true Church is 'by its Finance ye shall know it,' it is not surprising that not only the bishoprics and archdeaconries, but also the deaneries should be claimed for our Church financiers.

(3) The third enemy to clerical learning is the taint of heresy which has become attached to it due to the use of scientific research and critical methods in Biblical, doctrinal and ecclesiastical studies. When Dr. Percival appointed Rashdall, Streeter and Lilley Canons Residentiary of Hereford, there was an outcry in ecclesiastical circles because all three, although most conspicuously learned, were suspect of heresy; and it was this

suspicion incurred by their learning which had hitherto precluded them from receiving the promotion that was rightly their due. Of course it is possible for greatly gifted and very influential clergymen like Bishop Gore and other leaders of the *Lux Mundi* school to fall under suspicion of heresy and to survive it triumphantly, but this is not given to any except the greatest and bravest. As in our younger days ordinands used to withdraw from Canon Driver's Old Testament lectures at Christ Church because they found they were 'losing their faith,' so also, not a few ordained clergymen have turned from modern theological learning because they discovered it was bringing them into conflict with ecclesiastical tradition and threatened to prejudice their happiness and influence in the Church's Ministry.

Whilst it is true, as the Son of Sirach wrote, that 'The Wisdom of the scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure' (*Ecclus.* xxxviii, 24), and there is little leisure in the parochial life of the modern clergyman, yet there are still a number of posts in the Church, in which learning can be conscientiously cultivated, and which the Church authorities ought to take thought to fill with actual and potential scholars whose learning might be of the greatest use to the Church and Nation. For, as Bishop Mandell Creighton maintained — and who better fitted to judge than he — the appeal to sound learning is the characteristic mark of the Church of England; and as the standard of national education rises, the need for learned clergy becomes more imperative. Of course all our clergy cannot be learned, and there is no need that they should be learned. What is needed is a sufficiency of learned clergy whose knowledge would guide Church policy, influence their fellow-clergy, and secure respect for the public teaching of the Christian religion. Our Church must be an *ecclesia discens* and an *ecclesia docens*. Without the spirit of Chaucer's Clerk of Oxenford,

> 'For gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly teche,'

the culture of the nation must cease to be Christian, and we must suffer the disastrous segregation of religion from the great stream of national thought and policy instead of securing that higher synthesis and blessed unity in which religious men are not afraid to think and thinking men are not ashamed to be religious.

Here it must be added that the Church does need not simply men of learning, but men who know how to use their learning. An Irish student once remarked of a learned Cambridge Doctor of Divinity:

> 'It is wonderful to think of all that old man has got in his head and the very little power he has of getting it out.'

'Freddie is bogged by his learning' was the comment passed on Baron Friedrich von Hügel by one of his relations. This was not true of Von Hügel, although it is true of many erudite men who lack clear thought and the power of lucid exposition. Learning is not enough; but, on the other hand, 'a little learning is a dangerous thing.'

Moreover, for the rank and file of the Ministry scholarship is out of the question. Their greatest assets as religious teachers will be Christian experience, courageous sincerity and the open mind. There are cases when clergy may be as much hampered by the learning of the schools as was David by Saul's armour. We cannot forget that the Twelve Apostles were 'unlearned and ignorant men,' and our Lord warned his primitive disciples when on their trial to trust to the Spirit of their Father speaking in them rather than to premeditated orations. This must not be interpreted as meaning that the twentieth century clergyman ought not to try and keep abreast of modern thought in its bearing on the Christian religion. It is complained that the modern clergyman is satisfied with the daily journal, the weekly Church newspaper, the detective story, the latest popular play or novel. It is easy to blame him, but is it just? There is hardly a member of his congregation whose reading extends above this level, and he 'lays the flattering unction to his soul' that he must read what they read. If he reads anything more profound he will certainly get above their heads and his teaching and conversation will separate him from his parishioners instead of drawing them to him. In a way he is right. He has got to keep, if he be a good religious educationist, on a level in his teaching and conversation which makes him understandable and attractive to his parishioners. On the other hand, if the clergy, as a body are to carry real weight with the nation, they must possess a much larger proportion of sound thinkers and good scholars than is the case at present; and these sound thinkers and good scholars

have to be assigned positions in the Church's Ministry in which they can influence the thought and policy of the Church as a whole and enable her to command the intellectual respect of the nation.

Religion and the B.B.C.

The B.B.C. has made and is making a valuable contribution to the devotional religious life of many British citizens. Its daily services, consisting of simple, heartfelt prayers, well-selected Scripture readings, and inspiring practical addresses, thoughtfully delivered by well-modulated voices, are proving helpful to the religious life of many and have become models for public and private devotional services. Those who wish well unto our Zion owe a debt of gratitude to the B.B.C. for this.

There is, however, a growing feeling that in addition to the help given by the B.B.C. in stimulating and developing the devotional life of the British people, the B.B.C. ought to give more help to the religious life in the sphere of the intellect by way of encouraging those who desire to use its broadcasts to fulfil the peculiarly Christian obligation of loving God 'with all thy mind.' The B.B.C.'s method of adhering to the 'mainstream of the Christian tradition' is leading to the exclusion of much stimulating religious teaching from its programmes, with the result that very often a one-sided presentation of the Christian religion is all that is granted to thoughtful and enquiring auditors.

Lieut.-Colonel E. N. Mozley (himself a great-nephew of Cardinal Newman) in an article entitled 'Religious Liberty and the B.B.C.,' published in the October issue of *The Hibbert Journal*, demands that the points of view of Christians who are not regarded as being in the 'mainstream of the Christian tradition' should be heard 'on the air.' He believes that the public would benefit by hearing not only the religious convictions of unorthodox Christians, but also the exponents of Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, and other great historic faiths. He desires also that competent teaching should be given in the sphere of Comparative Religion, the History of Religion, and the Philosophy of Religion.

We regard Colonel Mozley's demand as reasonable; but in granting it certain considerations must be borne in mind, if the

B.B.C.'s religious teaching is to be helpful and not harmful to the nation's moral and spiritual life. First, religious controversy must be checked if it cannot be excluded. The B.B.C. ought not to be made a cock-pit of religions. Secondly, inasmuch as Britain is a Christian country and our British civilization has been inspired and moulded by Christian ideals, the Christian religion must be given the first and more important place in religious programmes. Thirdly, inasmuch as the B.B.C. educational programmes are intended for those who are not scholars, only those aspects of Religion can be presented which do not demand technical language and intricate and difficult arguments. This unfortunately tempts the lecturer to deal in superficial generalities which puff up rather than build up his auditors What then is to be done if these disasters of religious controversy on the one hand and banal superficiality on the other are to be avoided?

It seems to us that the B.B.C. authorities should concentrate on making known to the public the methods and results of research in various fields which are influencing the modern understanding of Religion : such, for instance, as Anthropology, Comparative Religion, Archaeology, Biblical Literary Criticism, the Psychology of Religion, and Psychical Research. Results that are being secured in these fields will supply a great number of illuminating themes for the understanding of religion, and not least of the Christian religion, if handled by really competent instructors whose main purpose is not to provide apologetic teaching for traditional Christian believers, but scientific truth which will awaken interest in the study of Religion by those who perhaps hitherto have viewed Religion with indifference and contempt.

This, however, will never be successfully accomplished until not only competent lecturers are selected but also those whom the public will feel can be trusted not simply to know the facts but to present them without apologetic bias. We recognize that the B.B.C. has already made a start in this direction, in recent courses of lectures on Biblical Criticism ; and we hope that it will not hesitate to proceed much further.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

The warmly welcomed appointment of Prebendary Wilson Cash, D.S.O., O.B.E., General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and the Right Rev. Bishop N. B. Hudson, M.C., D.S.O., Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, to be Bishops respectively of Worcester and Newcastle, is not without significance. Prebendary Wilson Cash is, like the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, a Canadian. He served with distinction as a Chaplain in the Great War. Bishop Hudson as a layman had a not less distinguished career in the same grim struggle. We opine, however, that their promotion to English bishoprics is not intended as a reward for such services—though few could refuse approval if they were. Those who serve self-sacrificingly in such a cause earn that good report of their countrymen which is a needful qualification for promotion to high office in the Church. What, however, is significant is that the chief officials of our great missionary societies should both be simultaneously transferred to bishoprics. Does this mean that for the duration of the war our missionary societies are very largely out of action? This is certainly so in Japan and China. This raises the further question whether the day of sending out Christian missionaries to foreign lands is not drawing to a close.

At the end of the present war, should the Allies be victorious, the world will be more closely united than ever before. The human race will not actually constitute one community, but an intimate knowledge of each nation's economic, political, social and religious conditions will be available for all. This must affect Christian propaganda abroad. When our great missionary societies were founded, the Christian religion depended for its propagation upon the personal qualities of the missionaries themselves : their word was the Christian Gospel ; their character the Christian character; their science and art, their literature and educational methods the gifts of Christian civilization. To-day this is no longer the case in heathen lands. The Christian religion is now seen by the educated pagan in the light or in the darkness of our Christian civilization. If Christian civilization in England, for instance, is seen to possess indispensable values for political, social and economic life, the heart of the heathen

will be prepared to welcome it. But if our Christian civilization seems in many respects to be no better, but even worse, than the better kind of pagan civilization, Christian propaganda will count for little, however good a man the missionary may be.

Already the journalism, the literature, the drama, the art, the popular entertainments, the social and domestic conditions, the political policies and forms of government, the leading personalities of so-called Christian lands must be having a much more powerful effect in commending or discrediting Christianity among the heathen than the influence of individual Christian missionaries working single-handed. Co-operative literary propaganda and educational institutions seem destined more and more to replace the older evangelistic methods. The work of the British and Foreign Bible Society, with its translation of the Scriptures into a thousand foreign languages, is of the highest value. Might not this work of literary propaganda for Christian missionary purposes be vastly extended, especially in those lands where the Christian missionary is felt to be no longer needed? Might not much be done to propagate Christianity by well-selected efforts to present the best side of Christian culture and civilization? What the Bible Society desires to achieve by means of the Bible might be very usefully extended into other fields of Christian literature.

There is a large field for missionary effort in assisting the higher educated life of native Churches, which show a deplorable tendency to degenerate when simply dependent upon their local native missionaries for Christian thought and leadership. Educational missions of help to them can be of the greatest service. Of course, what is being done by Achimota on the Gold Coast, Trinity College, Kandy, in Ceylon, the C.M.S. at Zaria in Northern Nigeria, and similar efforts elsewhere has led the way in showing how old ideals may be realized by new methods. The post-war period must demand much re-grouping and reorganization of the Christian front if the new pagan world as well as the old pagan world is to be won for Christ. In that endeavour our Christian communities at home will have to co-operate with Christian representatives abroad by making their immediate objective the propagation of Christian influence and ideals rather than the conversion of individuals.

To-day it is only when the individual missionary has the civilization and culture of his Christian community behind him that his word when addressing pagans can be with power. Otherwise, the pagan's reply to the preaching of the Christian missionary must be 'the civilization and culture of the Christian community which has presumed to send you to us so emphatically contradicts your message as to discredit it.'

The English Clergy and the Pope.

For some years past there has been an underground movement in extreme Anglo-Catholic circles to promote an acknowledgement of 'some sort of primacy' of the Pope. In the concluding contribution to the Sign Post Series, the Rev. A. H. Rees attempted to maintain that English Churchmen, while rejecting the political authority of the Pope in the realm of England, may yet lawfully acknowledge the Pope's spiritual authority. Professor Norman Sykes having demonstrated in a review of Mr. Rees' book the fallacious character of the position advanced by Mr. Rees, Father Gregory Dix of Nashdom Abbey, a monastery of Anglo-Catholic Benedictines, came undauntedly to the rescue of Mr. Rees in the September number of *Theology*, maintaining that Dr. Sykes, in his criticism of Mr. Rees, shows himself to be grievously behind the times.

Dr. Sykes initiates his confutation of the claims that English Churchmen may lawfully acknowledge the Pope's spiritual authority, by citing a passage from *Tract* XC. This citation proves John Henry Newman was convinced that English Churchmen were bound as such to assert that the Pope has no 'jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within the realm.' Dr. Sykes proceeds in masterly fashion to demonstrate by citation that from the days of Henry VIII down to the present time all English clergymen have been required to declare that they reject all Papal claims to authority of whatsoever kind within this realm.

In this connection, not the least interesting piece of evidence is that provided by Archbishop Wake's correspondence. This eighteenth century Archbishop of Canterbury was much interested in the Church of France and in the Gallican movement which sought to secure for that Church virtual liberation from

Papal control. Some of the leaders of that movement felt that this could best be secured by denying to the Pope all political and administrative authority over the French Church, while conceding to him a 'spiritual' authority. Wake judged the policy a bad one, and urged that the French Church should make no concession of 'spiritual' authority to the Pope, but take the line of the Church of England which allowed the Pope no authority of any kind whatsoever.

It is to be hoped that no Christian would refuse to the episcopal head of an ancient Christian Church, whether of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria or Rome, that respect which is due to him; but to treat him with respect is not, of course, to acknowledge his authority outside his sphere. 'Ah! there's the rub.' The Pope as the Vicar of Christ claims all Christians to be within his sphere of authority, and unless they submit to his authority he refuses to them Christian communion and fellowship. By this policy he has become not only the great autocrat but also the great schismatic of Christendom. Although Archbishop Cranmer in St. Mary's, Oxford, uncovered and bowed to his other judges, he ignored the papal representative who sat with them. To take any other line to-day in this country is to beguile simple people and to confuse the issues.

It seems to us that those Anglo-Catholics who are carrying on a movement for acknowledging the spiritual authority of the Pope by English Churchmen are doing what superficially seems innocent enough, but is really fraught with disastrous consequences. We are convinced that this Anglo-Roman movement which, under the attractive guise of Christian charity and Catholic order, claims spiritual authority for the Pope in this country, is bound to confuse the issue for simple and well-meaning Christians, and, like the Jacobite toast, aims at undermining the loyalty which is due to our true rulers:

> 'God bless the King: God bless our Faith's Defender;
> God bless—no harm in blessing—the Pretender:
> But which Pretender is, and which is King,
> God bless us all, is quite another thing.'

FRUMENTIUS: THE APOSTLE OF ABYSSINIA, AND HIS CHURCH

THE story of the Ethiopian Empire stretches far back into history. The name 'Ethiopia' covered a vast but indefinite area, including all Africa south of Libya and a large part of Arabia, within which (so Pliny tells us) forty-five kingdoms were included, Meroë being the chief. The modern name, Abyssinia, is derived from Habesh, an independent province, whose gradual ascendency over the rest was probably due to the fact that the beautiful but inaccessible highlands of Abyssinia formed part of it. The people are still called 'Habeshies' by the Arabs. St. Jerome says that the Ethiopian Eunuch was returning to Arabia when St. Philip met him; there is no trace in Ethiopian annals of a queen called Candace, but the name was the title of the queens of Meroë, as Pharaoh was that of the ancient rulers of Egypt. The boundaries of this great Ethiopian Empire were: north, Egypt; south, the Abyssinian highlands; east, the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea; west, the Lybian Desert, itself practically boundless. Abyssinia of to-day is a small kingdom, surrounded by strong non-Christian countries, an island washed by dangerous seas. It is the sole surviving Christian kingdom in Africa, and but for their fiercely conservative spirit, their unbreakable fidelity to tradition and religion, their profound fear and mistrust of all alien and non-national influences, these strange, fine, tragic people must have perished long ago. The remarkable differences in the Abyssinian people in colour, features, physical structure and character, are explicable only by the vast difference of lands and races from which they have come. The two chief strains are the Semitic, or Arab, marked by fine, small bones, slender limbs, aquiline features and olive complexions, and the Hamitic, or African, shown in the larger and more solid frames, negroid features and colouring of this section. It is probably that only about one quarter of the population (pre-war about 10,000,000) are of purely Abyssinian

descent. Though Abyssinia is a Christian country, it includes many non-Christian communities: the Danakils are Moslems, the Gallas, a mixture of Christians, Moslems, and pagans; the Falashas, while nominally Christians, exhibit many Jewish traits, being descended from the converts made by early Jewish missionaries from heathen tribes. All these non-Christian elements lived peaceably under Abyssinian rule before the Italian War. Geographical isolation and national pride and insularity have retarded education and progress in Abyssinia: lightning slave-raids into the Sudan enraged the Sudanese and complicated the task of the British Government at Khartoum for many years; but as most of the Abyssinians regard non-Christian peoples as having no souls, they saw no harm in a practice which kept their young men in fighting trim and was otherwise generally advantageous.

The conversion of Abyssinia was attributed to St. Andrew by St. Jerome, to St. Matthew by Socrates (the Church historian), and to St. Thomas by St. Chrysostom; but these traditions lack support, and the generally accepted account, given by word of mouth by Edesius, the brother of Frumentius, to his friend Rufinus, and incorporated in Sozomen's *History of the Church from A.D. 323 to A.D. 425*, may be accepted as the truth.

> 'Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre in Phoenicia, journeyed as far as India . . . accompanied by two youths, named Frumentius and Edesius; they were his relatives; he conducted their rhetorical training and educated them liberally. After exploring India as much as possible he set out for home, and embarked on a vessel which was on the point of sailing for Egypt. It happened that, from want of water or some other necessary, the vessel was obliged to stop at some port, and the Indians rushed upon it and murdered all, Meropius included. These Indians had just thrown off their alliance with the Romans; they took the boys as living captives, because they pitied their youth, and conducted them to their King.'

The Indians were, of course, Abyssinians. Not long before the arrival of Meropius and his companions they had suffered some wrong or injustice at the hands of certain Roman traders, and they were determined to avenge themselves when opportunity occurred. The two young brothers would probably have perished with Meropius, but apparently they had wandered away some distance from the ship, and were found reading under a

tree; they knew nothing until the Abyssinians captured them. Abreha, the King, took them into his house and service;

> 'he appointed the younger one his cup-bearer; Frumentius he put over his house and made him administrator of his treasures; for he perceived that he was intelligent and very capable in business. These youths served the King usefully and faithfully, during a long course of years' (Sozomen).

On his death-bed, Abreha 'rewarded the goodwill of the servants with liberty,' and the brothers naturally were anxious to return to Tyre. But the queen implored them to stay and help her son, the young King Serazanes, during his minority; and 'they yielded to her entreaties (says Sozomen), and directed the affairs of the kingdom and the government of the Indians.'

Frumentius began to preach Christianity to the people soon after his admission into Abreha's service; he sought out other Christian foreigners in the land, and traders whose business brought them thither, and built 'houses of prayer' in which Christian services were held regularly. Frumentius, however, felt that his work was incomplete, for there were no clergy amongst them. As soon as Erzanes attained manhood, Frumentius and Edesius insisted upon leaving Abyssinia. Edesius returned to his family at Tyre, and soon after became presbyter (or bishop) of his native city. Frumentius, with whom, says Sozomen, 'patriotism and filial piety were subordinate to religious zeal,' refused to accompany Edesius. He went instead to Alexandria, and told his story to St. Athanasius, the Patriarch, begging him to send a bishop to Abyssinia to build up the Church there. Athanasius was in synod with his bishops and clergy, before whom he laid the matter; and after careful deliberation by them all, he solemnly gave the charge of the infant Church of Abyssinia to Frumentius, saying, 'What other man shall we find such as thou art, in whom is the Spirit of God, who will be able to discharge these duties?'

Frumentius was consecrated Bishop by St. Athanasius (A.D. 330), and returned to Abyssinia, where 'apostolic signs accompanied his ministry, and an infinite number of the barbarians were converted to the faith.' He placed his seat at Axuma (now Axum), which is still the Canterbury of Abyssinia, and the names 'Abba-Salamis — father of peace,' and 'Abuna

—our father,' given to him by his devoted flock, are still part of the title of the Metropolitan (Abuna) of Abyssinia.

The Abyssinian Church is thus derived from the Egyptian, or Coptic, Church, and the bond forged by the hands of St. Athanasius has never been broken, though time and circumstances have necessarily effected changes in their relationship. The Abuna of Abyssinia is always appointed by Alexandria; no change or agreement of any moment would be accepted by the Abyssinian Church unless, or until, it had been sanctioned by the Coptic. When the Church of Egypt rejected the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and upheld Monophysitism, Abyssinia followed it automatically into the 'separatist' camp. The story of this split in the Early Church must be told here, for this reason. The Egyptian hierarchy considered that Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, acknowledged the letter of the Coptic Bishop, Dioscorus (A.D. 444—454), announcing his election to the See of Alexandria as though Dioscorus was an inferior, and they deeply resented it. Five years later, Dioscorus presided over a Council at Ephesus, called by the Emperor Theodosius to examine Eutyches, Patriarch of Constantinople, upon charges of heresy; he refused to allow Leo's letter to the Council to be read, and excommunicated him. When Theodosius died the following year, Leo persuaded the new Emperor to call another Council, at Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and this Council deposed Dioscorus for disobedience to its decrees, but not for heresy; this point is always emphasized by the Copts, as well as their adherence to the first three General Councils of the Church. Only fourteen out of one hundred Egyptian Bishops accepted the ruling of the Council of Chalcedon; the majority held firmly by Dioscorus and his Egyptian successor, Timothy II, and Proterius, the Greek nominee of the Emperor with Leo's support, was murdered.

When the Church of Nubia was blotted out in the Mahommedan conquest, the position of Abyssinia became extremely precarious; the Church was cut off from frequent contact with the Mother Church of Egypt, which also was fighting for its life against the avalanche of triumphant Islam. No doubt geographical and climatic conditions helped to preserve Abyssinia,

but the stubborn fidelity with which it clung to the faith was the deciding factor. Errors in doctrine may have crept in during centuries of spiritual, geographical and political isolation, but it is still a Christian country and holds by the Creeds of the Church Catholic. The doctrine of the Unity of the Holy Trinity is carefully emphasized in Abyssinian teaching.

Abyssinian records reveal the recurrent disharmony between that country and Rome, which has coloured all its history and deeply disturbed its spiritual and civil life. In 1480 King John II of Portugal sent an expedition to explore Abyssinia under Pedro Cavilhan and Alfonso Payo, who both knew Arabic well. Payo died on the way, and it was not until 1490 that Cavilhan reached Abyssinia. He was well received by the Emperor Alexander, but upon that monarch's death soon after, the new Emperor Nahod refused Cavilhan liberty either to communicate with Portugal or to leave Abyssinia, on the grounds that he was a spy. Nahod died, and was succeeded by his son David, who was still a child, and Nahod's mother, being regent, tried to strengthen her grandson's inheritance by concluding an alliance with Portugal under which both kingdoms agreed to unite in expelling the Turks from the ports and coasts of the Red Sea. David grew up filled with sincere admiration and affection for Portugal and its people, as his letters to the King and to Pope Clement VII prove.

> 'If the ways were but once opened (he wrote to Clement), I should be able to correspond with the Roman Church as well as with other Christians, to whom, as to the Christian religion, I am nothing inferior; for as they believe One true Faith and One Church, so do I profess the same, and do most sincerely believe in the Holy Trinity, and in One God, and in the virginity of our Lady the Virgin Mary. I do also hold all the articles of the Christian Faith, and do keep them as they were writ by the Apostles.'

Writing to the King of Portugal (1521), he gives a vivid though unconscious picture of Abyssinian insularity of mind and body.

> 'I never had an Embassy sent to me before by any Christian King, neither was I certain there was a Christian King anywhere beside myself, having been always encompassed with Moors, the sons of Mahommed, and with heathens, and slaves . . . with whom I have never lived well, because though the faith has been preached to them, they refuse to come to the Truth' (Geddes, *Church History of Ethiopia*).

So utterly sincere was David in his belief that Abyssinia, Portugal and Rome were 'one in faith and doctrine, one in charity,' that he secured the consecration of a Portuguese, Joas Bermudez, as Abuna, and sent him to obtain help from Rome and Portugal against the Moslems, being convinced that, as Christians, they would be eager to help in a Holy War against the 'infidel.' Unfortunately, both Rome and Portugal interpreted these moves as shewing David's desire to join the Roman Church, and Joas, thus instructed, returned to Abyssinia and exerted pressure through the large and powerful Portuguese community there. But David died, and his son, Claudius, did not share his views; he first arrested and then expelled Bermudez, and the Patriarch of Alexandria appointed an Egyptian, Joseph, as Abuna.

Rome had no intention of relinquishing its hold upon Abyssinia. In 1588, Ignatius Loyala besought the Pope to send him out to Abyssinia to convert the land, and his plea being refused, he never rested until three Portuguese priests had been consecrated as Bishops and sent forth. Two of the Bishops, Minez Baretto and Melchior Carneiro, remained at Goa for some reason, and the third, Andrea Oviado, proceeded alone to Abyssinia. He was courteously entertained by Claudius, who nevertheless made it abundantly clear that neither he nor his people desired to leave their own Church for any other. Oviado and the Emperor conferred often together, but whereas Claudius desired only to prove the validity of his faith, Oviado was determined to subjugate the country to Portugal and the Church to Rome, and after a while he broke off relations by excommunicating the Abyssinian Church. Claudius fell in battle soon afterwards, and his brother and successor, Adam, imprisoned Oviado and threatened him with death if he persisted in his attempts at conversion. The Portuguese stirred up the Moslems, who invaded Abyssinia, and Adam fell fighting against them. Oviado declared himself Patriarch of Abyssinia and wrote to the General of the Jesuits for military aid and support.

> 'Nothing (he wrote) but a good body of Portuguese soldiers will ever be able to reduce Ethiopia to the Roman obedience.' (1566).

For 150 years the struggle between Rome and Abyssinia con-

tinued; the Abyssinians were often worsted but they were never conquered or pacified, neither were they, as a people, unfaithful to their Church, though the Emperor Seltam-Sagued (1613) made his submission to Rome in return for Portuguese military support, and one Alfonso Mendez was consecrated in Lisbon as Patriarch of Ethiopia (1624). Mendez established a training college in Abyssinia for Roman Catholic missionaries, and having dispossessed the native clergy of their churches in favour of Roman nominees, he announced that he had converted thousands in one year. The Abyssinians replied by murdering two Roman priests at Tigre, outside the churches they had taken over, and war broke out again. Rome and Portugal combined to punish the people, and many were burnt as heretics; civil war raged between the people and their Emperor and his foreign allies. After one particularly bloody engagement, as the Emperor stood looking over the heaps of dead, his son stabbed his conscience awake with the bitter words:

> 'This is no victory over Moslems or heathen, but over our flesh and blood, our fellow-subjects, our fellow-Christians! We destroy ourselves to put a sword into our enemies' hands. They need not slay us — they need only leave the work of extermination to ourselves!'

Stricken to the heart, Seltam-Sagued issued a proclamation to his people:

> 'We gave you the Roman faith, believing it to be true, but innumerable multitudes of my people have been slain on that account. . . . We do therefore restore the religion of your fathers to you, so that your priests are to take possession of their churches again and officiate therein as formerly.'

The people responded — 'God bless the Emperor! Let the Alexandrian faith flourish!'

Mendez, protesting vigorously against the overthrow of his life's work, retired to Goa, and died there as Archbishop, in 1656. Capucin missionaries tried more than once to restore the Roman power, but they were speedily murdered. In 1704, the Jesuits made one more attempt to enter Abyssinia under the protection of Louis XIV of France, but this failed too.

Frumentius is believed to have translated the Scriptures and the Apostolic Canons into Arabic. The Abyssinians divide the Old and New Testaments into four parts each; the New Testa-

ment order agrees with our own, the Old Testament includes the Apocryphal Books. There are three surviving copies of the Canons (numbering 470—480), two of which are in the Vatican and one in Abyssinia. The Liturgical language is Geez ('Lisana-Geez — tongue of the free'), but Amharic is the language of the educated classes, court, military and merchants; Arabic is spoken along the Sudan frontier, and dialects of Semitic origin such as Galla, Falasha, Tigrine, etc., are also common. The principal Liturgy is based on the Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril, and is called 'The Liturgy of All the Apostles'; there are also the Liturgies of our Lord, the Fathers of Nicea, St. Mary, Dioscorus, St. Epiphanius, St. James of Serug, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Gregory. The Holy Communion is celebrated daily, but at different times, at Christmas, Epiphany and Easter at midnight, on Sunday at dawn, Monday to Friday 3 p.m., and Saturday 10 a.m. Fasting Communion is the invariable rule, and the Eucharist is never celebrated in a house, not even for the king or the Abuna. Holy Communion is administered to a child at baptism. Lay Communion is irregular and infrequent. The bread is a flat round loaf, specially prepared and stamped with crosses; unleavened bread is used only on Thursday in Holy Week. The Prayer of Consecration says: 'This Bread is My Body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins. Amen,' to which the people reply, 'Amen, amen, amen. We believe and are certain. We praise Thee, O Lord our God. This is truly, and we thus believe, Thy Body.' The Act of Consecration is called 'the Change,' but the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is rejected. The wine is prepared by a deacon before each celebration from the juice of dried grapes, mixed with water; priest and people receive in both kinds. The deacon gives water to each person immediately after the administration of the cup, to cleanse their mouths and prevent any of the wine being left to mix with ordinary food partaken of later.

Baptism is by triple immersion; adults are clothed in red after baptism and are fed with milk and honey, in token of their entry into the spiritual Canaan. Infants are baptised by aspersion only if too ill to survive immersion; boys are baptised on

the fortieth, and girls on the eightieth, day after birth. Circumcision is general, but has no religious significance. Polygamy is allowed by the civil law and forbidden by the ecclesiastical; the clergy may not be married twice, and a priest will refuse the Holy Communion to a man who has more than one wife. In cases of divorce, a family of several children is divided between the parents, but if there is only one child under seven the mother keeps it, or if it is above seven it goes to the father. Divorce is permitted up to three times, re-marriage after this not being counted as marriage; a man who has been thrice through divorce cannot receive the Holy Communion unless he becomes a monk. Funeral rites are long and emotional; dancing forms part of them.

The Abyssinian calendar commemorates several saints daily, and the Nativity, the festivals of St. Michael the Archangel, St. Mary, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob once every month; Frumentius is commemorated three times during the year. Pontius Pilate is accounted a saint, for his saying, 'I am innocent of the Blood of this Just Man.' All the saints are portrayed with dark skins; devils are white. A large part of the Abyssinian year is taken up by the Fasts — forty days before Christmas, fifty-six before Easter, fourteen days before the feast of the Blessed Virgin, in August, as well as before other festivals; every Wednesday and Friday is a fast, and during Holy Week the only food allowed is bread and water. At Epiphany a strange ceremony takes place in honour of our Lord's Baptism, which is a renewal of baptism (but not re-baptism as the early Jesuits supposed); neglect of this annual purification of soul and body is believed to imperil the soul. It takes place at night, by the light of torches and flares; the clergy stand upon an elevation beside the river or stream, with the Ark of the Covenant in their midst, and bless the waters with crosses; after which men, women and children plunge naked into the water, immerse themselves, and emerge at once. The Abyssinians are a highly-strung and emotional people, and the scene is a wild one.

Abyssinian churches are circular in shape, and are divided into three sections within, for the laity (outer), clergy, and the Holy of Holies (innermost); this encloses the altar, which is of

stone, only one being erected in each church. In the north-west corner is a room called the 'Bethlehem,' or House of Bread, where the bread for Holy Communion is prepared and kept. Sacred pictures adorn the walls of the churches, but no images are allowed. The Tabot, or Ark, is made of wood; it is placed upon the altar and offerings and prayers are made before it. The Ark in the cathedral of Axum was of gold, set with jewels. The clergy are supported by their parishes, but they are often compelled to work to eke out their scanty living; the priesthood may run in families, but not by any rule or selection. Boys of fourteen are admitted to the diaconate, but not to the priesthood until they are of fit age. Frequent long processions protract the services; the sistrum of ancient Egypt, the drums of pagan Africa, and the gold-fringed velvet umbrellas of forgotten Asiatic pomp, are all used, bringing to the Western observer a strong sense of time standing still.

Rome has never lost her desire for supremacy in Abyssinia; the college in the Vatican City for training Abyssinian converts for the Roman priesthood is under the Pope's special care. The Italian war fell with equal force upon the Abyssinian Church and the people; the country was parcelled out amongst Italian colonists, who were sent out in large numbers from different parts of Italy. Fine roads connected Abyssinia with Eritrea and Italian Somaliland, but these were built for strategic and military purposes, large tracts of wild country being left outside their control, and here bandits and small bodies of Abyssinian patriots lurked, making life uneasy and unsafe for the new rulers. The foreign rulers travelled either in swift motors, suitably protected, or in military aircraft, whose destructive powers the people had learnt to fear in the war. The churches were 'cleansed' and handed over to Roman Catholic priests, the Abyssinian clergy being reduced to celebrating the Liturgy in caves, as under the Portuguese invaders of long ago. The aged Abuna Abraham, a man of seventy-five and blinded by Italian gas, was compelled to consecrate three suffragan bishops who submitted, with him, to Italy, the four prelates being escorted to and from the cathedral by Italian troops and machine-guns. Abraham's action was, of course, illegal, and it was immedi-

ately denounced by the See of Alexandria; he was the last of five Abyssinian Bishops consecrated in Alexandria, and he had taken the usual oath of fidelity to, and unity with, the Coptic Mother Church; this oath expressly renounces all right to appoint a sovereign or consecrate a bishop. Italy demanded from the British Administration in Palestine the cession to her of all Abyssinian holdings in the Holy Land—a claim which the Administration rejected.

Abyssinia is a backward country, but the Emperor Haile-Selassie has striven earnestly to raise and educate his people, welcoming European help to this end. Before the Italian war he had put down slavery in one province, and was trying to abolish it everywhere. Many of his chieftains, especially those immediately under his influence, were following his example of monogamy. He is a man of very high character and austere life, trusted and respected by his people; the Empress is a most devout woman, who has visited Jerusalem on pilgrimage several times. The Abyssinians declare that their Royal House is descended from a union between Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, and the Emperor's title of 'King of Kings and Lion of the House of Judah' embodies this belief. It is certain that Jewish missionaries were active in pagan Abyssinia in early ages, and strong traces of their influence still colour Abyssinian ritual and practice, and survive in such customs as the Levirate marriage, polygamy, and the keeping of the Sabbath as well as Sunday.

We have traced in outline the tragic story of a people whom circumstances have isolated from other Christian and cultural influences, who have kept the faith as it was delivered to them sixteen centuries ago, and have preserved their national unity under persistent foreign aggression; who prize religious and national liberty so dearly that they have never shrunk from paying the highest price for it, even life itself.

E. M. E. Blyth.

REUNION: DEFEAT OR A NEW OFFENSIVE*

By Canon T. Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Rector of Birmingham, Chaplain to the King.

NOT long ago in the *Sunday Times* Dr. Sidney Berry writing on the Churches and the War, brought his cheerful and buoyant disposition to bear upon the Reunion problem. He spoke of the war helping to break down the barriers between the different sections of the Church and of the fellowships which have been formed between Christians in England and the Christians of Holland, Czecho-Slovakia and Scandinavia:

> 'The vision grows of the world-wide fellowship of the Christian commonwealth . . . signs are evident everywhere that the Church's eyes are fixed on the future.'

It is pleasant to be able to endorse from my own experience in Birmingham the happy contacts of which Dr. Sidney Berry speaks, though I fear they do not take us very far in the direction of organic reunion. When our church of St. Martin was partially blitzed before Easter, who should I find working beside me in clearing away the debris but Dr. Howard, of the Methodist Theological College? He had come to preach in the somewhat shattered church, and did manage to do so, though the wind was blowing through a church without its main door or windows. One of the first subscriptions to reach us for our repair fund came with love and sympathy from the neighbouring Carr's Lane Church, which had offered its building for our use, with the same promptitude and in the same spirit as the Vicar of S. Sepulchre's offered his building to Leslie Weatherhead after the destruction of the City Temple. It would be possible to multiply examples of this friendly interchange of buildings and of pulpits. I have just returned myself from taking the whole of the morning and evening services at St. Sepulchre's — an Anglican parson conducting a Congregational Service in an

* Address given at the annual meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union — and expanded.

Anglican church on the invitation of a Methodist minister! This in itself, though unique, is quite in accordance with the spirit in many quarters and the custom happily established in many places.

But the point which I have to make and which I make with profound regret is that, although all these happy exchanges have no doubt both a local and psychological value, they are no indication that any great progress has been made with solving the vexed questions concerning Orders and Sacraments which still keep the Church of England sacramentally apart from the Free Churches and holds up the prospect of organic unity. When Dr. Sidney Berry writes in his article : ' Signs are evident everywhere that the Churches' eyes are fixed on the future,' he may be right in relation to post-war social reconstruction which, I think, he has primarily in mind, but it is certainly not true as regards the organic reconstruction of the Church itself. Our eyes are still fixed on the past, and we seem to get a crick in the neck when we try to face the other way.

It is more incumbent upon our Modern Churchmen's Union, I think, to face the situation which has arisen, or rather which has slowly but surely developed through the failure of successive conferences to produce action, than to follow the attractive line to which Dr. Sidney Berry has already done full justice.

The fact is that the high-water mark of our hopes for reunion was reached at the Lambeth Conference, 1920, and they have been receding ever since. That Conference came when the loosening effect of war, with its characteristic relaxation of ecclesiastical restrictions on intercommunion, was still strongly felt. The Padrés' Fellowship was still hovering on the brink of a decision to follow men like Dick Sheppard in a 'bold' venture to come to the Holy Communion with their fellow-Christians of other denominations. I can remember well how the Spirit moved us in that matter, and I can also remember the excellent person who torpedoed what we had in mind. But even in the highest circles reunion, not simply with Churches in the 'Apostolic succession,' but with good, simple, honest-to-God Non-conformists was considered both rational and even attractive. The encyclical address to all Christian people would

appear to have had them primarily in mind. Not then had the remote Churches of Latvia and Esthonia and Finland come 'to hand,' nor had the lure of the Orthodox Church begun, publicly at least, to twist and torture the interpretation of Anglican doctrine. We were honestly interested in Home Reunion and the Joint Committee of Anglican Bishops and Free Church Divines, which arose from the spiritual impetus of Lambeth, actually reached a common declaration, which looked to the ordinary person as a sufficient basis for the inauguration and construction of a new (ecclesiastical) order. The declaration has, alas, grown a little tarnished since then by constant reference to so-called qualifications in the context or reservations in the text itself, but at the time it seemed as if the gate of a new world had been thrown open to those who were seeking reunion with their fellow-Christians in the towns and villages of this country. Let the words stand on record for the future generation to assess, and let us thank God for the thrill they brought us at the time.

> 'We are prepared to say that the ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Churches concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.'

There is no doubt that the spiritual impetus for reunion released in 1920 was tremendous, but it was swiftly canalized by the Anglo-Catholics, whose principles unfortunately forbade them to allow it to flow freely in other directions, where any chance break in the chain of episcopal succession had intervened. The consequence was that leaders followed the line of least resistance, allowing doctrine to be sacrificed to order rather than order to doctrine. Rapprochement proceeded rapidly with the Orthodox Church; and on the most perilous interpretation of agreed doctrine, which threatened to mortgage the intellectual freedom of the Church, a measure of inter-communion was established. But wherever the Reunion Movement sought to embrace within one fold episcopal and non-episcopal ministry, Anglo-Catholic opposition became rampant. The whole spiritual movement of 1920 shattered itself on this demand for rigid uniformity on the question of Order, and this reluctance to concede the principle or mutual recognition, even to contracting parties, through the practice of occasional inter-communion.

If anyone will take the trouble to study the reports of the great ecumenical conferences of Lausanne and Edinburgh, he will be shocked to find how little progress has been made in dealing with this question of rigidity of order, which rests on no primitive tradition and is bound up with the whole conception of totalitarianism which is destroying the freedom and culture of the world. Behind it lurks the power sense which seeks to preserve monopoly and privilege, threatens the spiritual values of all religions, and haunts such secular institutions as the Trade Union Congress or the British Medical Association. The power of the keys — the most deadly power in the hands of a hereditary or priestly or official class — is what is really at stake, though not one in a hundred of the protagonists, who contend for the rigidity of episcopal orders, understands the seriousness of what he is asking for, or the impossibility of conceding it if the freedom of religious life is to survive. To identify the true Church with an Order entrusted to a group of men who can alone choose their successors, controlling for all time a monopoly of grace, is to give reality to a nightmare. Yet it is this subconscious feeling for caste, which in our blindness we imagine to be confined to Hinduism, that vitiates our Christianity and holds up indefinitely the progress of the Christian Church.

I remember how on one occasion in the year 1934 in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, where the most acute form of Pharisaism was manifested in regard to 'irregularities' in the friendly Church of Finland, I ventured to quote these words of the then Bishop of Calcutta: 'Are we to rule out the possibility of God under any circumstances being willing that a thing should be done which is not in accordance with the accepted rule of the Anglican Church?' The words were very far from popular, but I cannot help thinking that if the good bishop had sat through all the debates on Reunion in the Lower House (as has been my lot for many years) he would have forgiven the comment which I ventured to add—that it was not only the heathen but often zealous Churchmen who were busy making God in their own particular image.

But someone will say, surely things are not so bad after all from the point of view of reunion with the Free Churches when

there is actually in existence a sketch of a United Church, which has been submitted to Convocation, and when the South India scheme is still alive. I fear the answer to these two points is that the sketch, always very sketchy, remains a sketch with no architectural drive behind it, and the South India scheme is in grievous peril. It was very significant that when the Sketch of the United Church was introduced into the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury opposition arose to the resolution 'commending' it to the study of the Church. The fear was expressed that the word 'commend' might suggest some measure of approval, and efforts were made to substitute a more neutral word such as 'refer.' That was not a very hopeful start, and since then to the profound regret of many like myself, to whom reunion with the Free Churches has been the hope of a life-time, the eyes of our Free Church brethren have turned rather to reunion amongst themselves. The South India scheme, so critically attacked by Anglo-Catholics at home during the 1930 Lambeth Conference, has now begun to suffer from the doubts and suspicions which have been generated in the minds of the Free Church contracting parties. It is inconceivable that the controversy, which has now arisen in India about whether the doctrine of the Priesthood of all believers and the rights of the lay ministry are sufficiently guarded in the scheme, would ever have arisen if this bogey of the monopoly of grace, operating through episcopal ordination, had not been forced into the foreground. More and more the touchstone of confidence in all negotiations has come to be the outstanding question of intercommunion. The continued reluctance of the Church of England, and of the Anglican Communion generally, to commit itself to the principle of reciprocity, has made Free Churchmen ask themselves what they are really uniting with. Is it with a Church still holding the totalitarian views of the Roman Church under a characteristic Anglican disguise? They begin to fear lest they should sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

It is probable that the watershed of the present negotiations was reached when the strong and independent Church of Scotland, with its long-established Presbyterian tradition, made it plain to the Church of England that mutual recognition must precede reunion. The resolution passed by the General

Assembly in the year 1934, shortly after conversations had begun, came as a bombshell in the Anglican camp. It ran as follows:

> 'The General Assembly, however, desire, with a view to prevent any possible misunderstanding, that the Committee should respectfully inform the Representatives of the Church with which it confers that any agreement wih regard to the Orders and Sacraments of the conferring Churches can only be based on the recognition of the equal standing of the accepted communicants and ministers in each.'

Nothing, alas, could be more significant of the trend of opinion or of the hardening of the arteries within the Church of England than the fact that this resolution abruptly brought the conversations to an end. It is hard to think that a few years before our Church had spoken so boldly about non-episcopal ministries as real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church. 'Quantum mutatus ab illo!' In these circumstances it is evident that there is fundamental work to be done, within our own Church, in which both Liberal Catholics and Liberal Evangelicals within the Modern Churchmen's Union must combine if progress is to be made. The period of formula-searching is at an end. We cannot follow profitably any longer in the steps of Mr. Facing-both-ways. We cannot profess belief in non-episcopal grace and yet in all our corporate actions refuse to budge one inch beyond what belief in the episcopal monopoly of grace allows. We must settle the doctrine of the Church before we plunge into embarrassing situations where our good faith is questioned or our bluff liable to be called.

Two quotations from a recent article by Dr. Raven in a book called *Into the Way of Peace* are very much to the point. One is concerned with all those definitions of the Church which are so glibly assumed in ecumenical conferences. It reminds us that they leave us with the unsolved problem of the Society of Friends.

> 'No one will dare to deny that the Society of Friends is manifestly within the fellowship of the disciples, the blessed community, the Church which is the Body of Christ. Yet, if so, then the Lambeth Quadrilateral is unsound; sacraments and orders are not of the essence of the Church; the whole position needs rethinking and restatement.'

The other deals with the flagrantly dishonest argument that intercommunion hinders the cause of organic reunion, whereas

all experience goes to prove that psychologically it is the essential preliminary :

> 'One example of such blindness may be seen in the oft-repeated slogan that inter-communion must mark the end of the movement towards reunion, but cannot be used as a means towards it. This is, of course, a flat denial of the very nature of a sacrament; for a sacrament is not only a symbol of something given and attained but an instrument to its fuller reception and achievement. To restrict the sacrament of unity to its symbolic meaning, to strive for unity and yet refuse to employ the instrument appropriate to such a quest, is to fall into a grievous theological and religious error.'

I am more than ever convinced that the way of hope for the ecumenical movement lies in a bold attack upon the fetishes, the complexes, the superstitions which prevent the members of Christ's Church communicating together at the Table of their Common Lord. These will tend to disappear when illuminated by the Quaker witness to a non-sacramental (or universally sacramental) way of life. They will grow less when we confess doctrinally that the two Sacraments are not 'generally' necessary to salvation however spiritually helpful they may be in other ways. They will completely disappear by the courageous practice of intercommunion and by the discovery of the glorious liberty of the children of God into which Christians can then be led. When the custom has been established, under such guidance as a friendly and sympathetic authority may approve, a united Church will have already sprung into being, and the shaping of its constitution and organization can be undertaken with the assurance of ultimate success.

It is along these lines I beg that we may direct our efforts, realising that in so doing we reach the heart of the matter. This is our answer to those who at last have begun to admit that no change in the reunion problem — no further 'act' — will take place without an 'emotional reaction.' To some this seems to be a new and wonderful discovery, and in an almost ashamed way they now admit that the force of rationalized arguments can only be broken by 'experience' and by the emotional reaction which follows. Some of us have known it long ago, and through the happy experience of inter-communion with Christians of other Churches have found a new stimulus to intellectual thought as well as to Christian living. Through the testimony we are able to give — I can speak from personal experience — Anglo-

Catholic prejudice is often removed and Anglo-Catholic conversions take place. It is difficult to resist the plea of one who simply tells of an experience and of the spiritual blessing which it has brought to him.

I believe inter-communion is the only key which will unlock the door into the new world of which we dreamed in 1920. 'I can no other.'

DOUBLE SYMBOLISM

A DIFFICULTY IN EXPLAINING THE LORD'S SUPPER

By the Rev. A. B. Johnston, M.A., Rector of Welney.

THE Church Catechism defines a Sacrament as consisting of two parts, the 'outward and visible sign' and the 'inward and spiritual grace.' In the light of this excellent definition of a Sacrament, let us examine the teaching of the Catechism as to the significance of the Lord's Supper:

Question. 'What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?'
Answer. 'Bread and Wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received.'
Question. 'What is the inward part or thing signified?'
Answer. 'The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper.'

The second of these two questions, we venture to think, ought to have been put (as in the definition of 'Sacrament' by the Catechism) in the following form: 'What is the inward and spiritual grace?' Then the answer would be, not 'the Body and Blood of Christ,' but 'the loving self-sacrificing Spirit of Jesus.' Certainly, the outward sign is bread and wine; but the inward and spiritual grace is the loving self-sacrificing Spirit of Jesus.

The Catechism fails to make clear the fact that there is here a *double symbolism*. Bread and wine are the symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Body and Blood of Christ in the Crucifixion, when the Body was pierced with nails and tortured with pain and the Blood was shed by the piercing of his side with the spear, were the outward signs or symbols of an inward spirit of loving self-sacrifice even unto death. 'Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the

end.' His crucifixion was endured in perfect obedience to the will of his Heavenly Father. Thus we have a double symbolism :

(1) Bread and wine symbolize the crucified Body of Christ;

(2) The crucified Body symbolizes the loving and self-sacrificing Spirit of Christ.

The material bread and wine are the symbols of the crucified Body of Christ, and the crucified Body of Christ symbolizes the obedient self-sacrificing Spirit of Christ. The recognition of this double symbolism is omitted by the Catechism in its exposition of the Lord's Supper.

It is neither adequate nor intelligible to teach that the 'inward part or thing signified' is the Body and Blood of Christ, since the second part of this sacrament — the 'inward and spiritual grace'—is Christ's Spirit of self-sacrificing obedience and love. Our Catechism sins against reason, against intelligibility and against the child when it teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are the inward and spiritual grace of the Lord's Supper. *A Supplementary Instruction*[1] sees the difficulty when it says :

> *Question* (No. 35). 'What is the outward sign and inward grace of Holy Communion?'
>
> *Answer*. 'The outward sign of the Holy Communion is Bread and Wine given and received as the Lord commanded; and the inward grace is the Body and Blood of Christ, that is the gift of Himself to the faithful children of God.'

Clearly 'the gift of himself' does not mean the gift of his historical Body and Blood of nineteen hundred years ago, but the gift of his living Spirit by the Ascended Christ.

We suggest that the answer in Question 35 of the *Supplementary Instruction* should be amended to 'and the inward grace is the Spirit of Christ, that is the gift of Himself to the faithful children of God.' The Spirit of the historic Jesus is the Spirit of the Eternal Christ shed abroad in Christian hearts to-day. But the Body of the historic Jesus—the Body of flesh and blood—is not the Body of Christ to-day. To-day Christ's Body on earth is the Christian Church. It is true to say that the Eternal Christ gives his Spirit *to* men, but it is not true to say that Christ gives his Body and Blood *to* men. He gave his Body

[1] *A Supplementary Instruction*. Published by the Church Assembly Press and Publications Board. Price 1*d*.

and Blood for men—that is a fact of history; and he gives for ever his Spirit *to* men—that is a fact of spiritual experience.

We might say, if we wish to express ourselves in a modern way, that 'the inward grace of the Lord's Supper is the loving self-sacrificing *Personality* of Christ.' Or we might say that Christ gives his *Presence* to the faithful communicant in the Lord's Supper. The phrase 'Real Presence' is, however, too ambiguous to be satisfactory. 'Spirit of Christ' is the best phrase to use.

> 'Speak to him, thou, for he hears, and spirit with spirit can meet—
> Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.'

It is hardly possible to think clearly and intelligibly about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper unless we recognize its double symbolism. The bread and wine symbolize the crucified Body of Christ. The crucified Body is a sacrament or symbol of the loving self-sacrificing Spirit of Jesus. Thus the bread and wine symbolize the Spirit of Jesus. The body of the historic Jesus is material, and cannot be the inward and spiritual grace which the logic of sacramental definition requires. Christ gave his body *for* us on the Cross. He gives his Spirit *to* us in the Holy Communion. The Catechism ought to teach this clearly.

BOOK REVIEWS

BOOKS OF PERMANENT RELIGIOUS INTEREST RECENTLY PUBLISHED IN AMERICA

By the Rev. Randolph Crump Miller, Ph.D., Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

American scholars and publishers have combined to produce a great number of fine books in the last few years. Some of them have had a great reception and others of equal value have not 'caught on' as well as they deserve. A review of the most important of these books is both helpful and suggestive for filling gaps in one's library.

Of books written by Episcopalians, *The American Prayer Book*, by Edward Lambe Parsons and Bayard Hale Jones (Scribners, 1937, $2.50) is the most significant. The book not only contains most of the important material presented in volumes by English scholars, it also contains more recent developments of research and several ideas of the co-authors which are worthy of serious consideration.

> 'Worship is after all the supreme function of the Church. Whatever contributes to the better understanding of its nature, whatever

> reveals the essential unity of the worship of the Christian ages, whatever helps to make worship more worthy of God, must have its place in drawing Christians closer together. The comprehensiveness, the variety, and the unity, which constitute the real Catholicity of our faith, are nowhere more adequately expressed than in worship.'

There are a remarkably condensed and accurate account of the development of Christian worship, an adequate description of the various services and their evolution, a bringing up to date of Prayer Book revision in various Churches of the Anglican communion, and a valuable summary of the recent changes in the American Prayer Book. Among new solutions proposed for long standing problems in the field are, (1) an excellent but technical account of the origin of the Church year and the lectionaries, (2) the evolution of the western Litany, (3) the early stages of both the Eucharist and the Baptismal rites, (4) the relation of the Gallican and Roman forms, (5) the origin of the Roman Canon, (6) the introduction of the Lord's Prayer, *Sanctus,* and *Benedictus* into the Liturgy, (7) the structure of the concluding devotions for the administration of Holy Communion, especially the problem of the 'last collect,' and (8) the evolution and import of the ordination services. There are an excellent glossary, ample footnotes, and adequate index.

A second book of importance in the field of Liturgics is *The Book of English Collects,* by John Wallace Suter, Jr. (Harper and Brothers, 1941, $2.90), which is a compilation of all the collects in the various Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion. The book is extremely valuable for three reasons: (1) There is an excellent essay on the collect form, which is a very exacting style of writing. A collect

> 'is a written prayer, composed to be said aloud by a minister on behalf of a group of people, as an act of public worship, offering to God either a petition or thanksgiving; following the patterns of one or another of several distinct literary forms, each of which has its own rhythmic design. It can be short or long, but compactness of expression is a normal characteristic, and more often than not the prayer is limited to a single sentence' (p. xxxvi).

There follows a discussion of three types of collects and possible endings. (2) The collects themselves compose the bulk of the book. There are 579 of them. The index makes it possible to locate a collect on almost any subject from one of the seven Prayer Books: English, English Revised (1928), Canadian, Irish, Scotch, South African, and United States. (3) The notes give the books in which the collects appear, record the many variations, and list the authors and sources so far as they are known. This is one of the most beautiful and useful books to appear for a long time.

A definitive book in the field of religious knowledge is Douglas Clyde Macintosh's *The Problem of Religious Knowledge* (Harper and Brothers, 1940, $3.50). It does for religious knowledge what the same author's *The Problem of Knowledge* (1915) has done for the philosophical problem of

knowledge in general. It is important because it offers an invaluable critique of practically every effort in this field and because it is an admirable summary statement of Professor Macintosh's unique position known as 'critical monism.' Thus it serves as an important foundation for empirical theology. An understanding of his primary assumption is necessary as a basis for his criticisms of other positions. Because of his strict interpretation of verification, he considers all dualists fundamentally, agnostic. Only what can be verified in *direct experience* can we rightly consider true, and the dualists cannot provide for any direct experience of reality. The book is divided into four parts, beginning with the naïve realists in religion, the mystics, who have no objective test outside the experience itself. Part II deals with the monistic idealists, who reduce God to an idea. There are several varieties in this group: religious psychologism, psychiatric interpretations, humanism, and logical-psychological idealism. The chapters on John Dewey and George B. Foster are particularly helpful. Part III represents Macintosh's 'critical monistic realism,' which he measures against similar theories held by Gerald Birney Smith, John Oman, John Baillie (in his latest book), von Hügel, and Henry Wieman. Part IV deals with the many types of dualism, most of which find their source in Kant. Thomists, Ritschlians, empiricists, and 'reactionary irrationalists' are all guilty of a dualistic agnosticism. In the end, they provide only helpful hints for building the superstructure of theology after the foundation has been established and verified by means of a critical monism. God, who exists independently of his being perceived (realism), can be *partially* experienced and thus *to that extent directly verified*. 'There is a partial identity between the immediately experienced and the independently real in the religious realm' (p. 357). God is *known* as the immanent, divine value-producing factor in the cosmos, verified in the right religious adjustment. From this point, we proceed to the realms of normative and metaphysical theology where verification is impossible but where there can be consistency with the meagre (but important) concept of God which has been verified. This is one of the great books in this field, and it is a permanent contribution to Christian scholarship.

Other important books in the field of religious knowledge are Harold Bosley's *Quest for Religious Certainty* (Willett, Clark & Co., 1939, $2.50) and John Baillie's *Our Knowledge of God* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939, $2.50). The former is the expression of the methodology of John Dewey, Morris Cohen, and Henry Wieman, applied in an original and convincing fashion to the data of religious living. The latter is a mature statement of Christian belief against the background of Barth, Brunner, and the Scotch tradition. Dr. Bosley deals with the relationship between tentativeness and certainty in the fields of theology, worship, and ethics. He finds no certainty of beliefs, for they are always open to revision, alteration, and even denial. The certainty lies in the method used and in the commitment of the self to the supreme value structure of the universe. This analysis brings one to a

new understanding of an age-old problem. Man, his values, and God are integral parts of nature; they are facts of daily experience. Our concept of God comes to us primarily through Jesus, who insisted upon the centrality of love in the universe, the absolute claim of love upon a man, and the validation of love in the sphere of action. Dr. Baillie has turned away from Ritschlianism and dualism, and now talks of 'confrontation with God' in the manner of the American empiricists, although he still does not understand American empiricism! He has drawn his inspiration from Barth, Brunner, von Hügel, and Maritain, but he does not do this by borrowing. He measures his thought against that of these men, and on the anvil of his criticisms comes his own distinctive position. His final position may be compared with Temple's *Nature, Man and God* (another of the great books of the decade), and there is the same error inherent in his inability to fill in the 'gap' between natural and revealed theology. As does Temple, he argues so persuasively for the knowledge of God that the appeal to special revelation seems an afterthought to please the more conservative. Dr. Baillie has made a permanent contribution to Christian theology in this beautifully written book.

In the general field of theology and philosophy of religion, Reinhold Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures, *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* of which Volume I has appeared (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941, $2.75) has already been accepted as the greatest of Niebuhr's books. Man, he says, is a child of nature who at the same time transcends nature and self. The Biblical view of man corrects the errors of Greek, Roman, Reformation, and and Renaissance anthropology by seeing man in his wholeness as having meaning in the sight of God. For man

> 'to understand himself truly means to begin with a faith that he is understood from beyond himself, that he is known and loved of God and must find himself in terms of obedience to the divine will' (p. 15).

Man faces God as a Judge because he is a sinner, and he only is assured of God's mercy through the Atonement. The full story is not developed in this volume, and we await the next one with eagerness. Also in this field are *The Growth of Religion,* by Henry Nelson Wieman and Walter Marshall Horton (Willett, Clark & Co., 1938, $5.00), which is an unwieldy combination of comparative religions and Wieman's latest statement of his thought. It is of relatively permanent significancy because Wieman has measured his naturalism against the thought of St. Paul and Brunner, and it is full of profound insights into the meaning of religious living. There is a dynamic quality about a theology based on 'the growth of meaning and value' which is a healthy contrast to the theology of tension which one finds in Niebuhr. Also by Henry Wieman and Regina Westcott Wieman is the best recent book in another field, *The Normative Psychology of Religion* (Thomas Y. Crowell, 1935, $3.50). Modern functional psychology is combined with the theory of values to bring about a study which is not

reduced to inner states. This book is the most important contribution to psychology of religion since J. B. Pratt's *The Religious Consciousness* (1920). Harris Franklin Rall's *Christianity* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, $2.50) won the $15,000 Bross Prize and is worthy of serious consideration. H. R. Macintosh's *Types of Modern Theology* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937, $5.00) is hardly an American contribution but has become one of America's most important books. There are some important essays in *The Nature of Religious Experience* (Harper and Brothers, 1937, $2.50), in which former students of Douglas C. Macintosh evaluate critically the knowledge value of religious experience.

There have been some significant publications in the field of New Testament. Probably the most important is *The Search for the Real Jesus,* by Chester C. McCown (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, $2.50). Throughout the last century of research into the life of Jesus, Professor McCown makes clear and explicit the implied correlation between historical method and philosophy of history. We see Strauss' *Life of Jesus Critically Examined* not only as the first fruits of historical method but also as the product of an essentially unsound philosophy of religion. His acceptance of Hegelian philosophy determined 'the direction which the search for the real Jesus should take. The direction was totally wrong' (p. 51). The story centres in German thought, because England and America have, on the whole, retarded the advance of scholarship. This development after Strauss took three paths: (1) Some followed the destructive, mythical approach of Strauss to its logical conclusion (Bruno Baur, Couchoud, and others); (2) others worked within the Hegelian dialectic, but made a better use of the historical tools (Bauer and the Tübingen school); (3) Niebuhr, Ranke and others avoided as far as possible peculiar historical and theological presuppositions and treated their sources as they would any other documents. In the advances that were made, the fourth Gospel caused untold trouble, and the outstanding man in reaching a conclusion concerning this book was Benjamin W. Bacon. Then came the 'liberal Jesus,' eschatology, the social gospel, form history, and to-day there is no great body of agreed opinion. McCown's conclusions are that we must seek better tools and a better philosophy of religion. 'There is still enough of the historical Jesus to stir the conscience and challenge the world' (p. 305). Historical study will always be the handmaid of theology, and while some will be disappointed at the meagreness and confused nature of the evidence concerning the real Jesus, the conclusions of this book are positive and hopeful.

Another recent book of outstanding value is Ernest W. Parsons' *The Religion of the New Testament* (Harper and Brothers, 1939, $2.50). In this book the results of many years of detailed scholarship are filtered through a fine mind, and the results are particularly helpful because the author lets the facts speak for themselves. He begins with the religion of Jesus, and this chapter should be read by everyone who desires to see the

picture which lies behind the gospels. From this introduction, he proceeds to outline the religions of the pre-Pauline Christians, Paul, the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, Hebrews, the Apocalypse, the Fourth Gospel, and the remaining documents. The first chapter becomes the norm by which the others are judged, and yet each is allowed to speak for itself. It is a book impossible to summarize and important to read and ponder.

A book from England has become sufficiently important in America to deserve mention: *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* by H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright (E. P. Dutton, 1938, $5.00). This mammoth volume is the best single commentary on the Gospels. Frederick C. Grant's *Gospel of the Kingdom* (Macmillan & Co., 1940, $2.00) is indispensable for an understanding of the *positive* contribution of form criticism to American scholarship when handled by an expert modernist theologian. Henry J. Cadbury's *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (Macmillan Co., 1937, $2.00) is a valuable warning to all writers and all Christians who, consciously or unconsciously, would form Jesus in their own image. Harry Emerson Fosdick's *Guide to Understanding the Bible* (Harper and Brothers, 1938, $3.00) is the best book for laymen which has yet appeared.

In the field of church history, the most significant publication is the projected series of books by Kenneth Latourette on *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (Harper and Brothers, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, $3.50 per volume). The first four volumes have already appeared: *The First Five Centuries, A Thousand Years of Uncertainty, Three Centuries of Advance,* and *The Great Century.* The purpose is to trace the missionary expansion of the Church, showing the effect of the Church on the surrounding culture and of the environment on Christianity. It is an amazing display of the finest scholarship, amply annotated with primary sources. A similar one-volume treatment is *Militant in Earth,* by Edward R. Hardy, Jr. (Oxford University Press, 1940, $3.00). In the field of American church history, Charles Howard Hopkins has done a definitive job on *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism,* 1865—1915 (Yale University Press, 1940, $3.00). This book corrects many of the light-hearted and light-headed criticisms of the so-called 'social gospel,' and shows how the origin of this movement is centred in the great Christian stream. The birth of the social emphasis took place in the years 1865-80. It came of age by the beginning of the twentieth century, and it was far from dead when Dr. Hopkins concluded his story. H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Kingdom of God in America* (Willett, Clark, 1937, $2.00) is an important contribution.

Some of these books in history point towards the future. In *Can Christianity Save Civilization?* (Harper and Brothers, 1940, $2.00), Dr. Walter Marshall Horton explicitly uses history to show the religious nucleus of all cultures and comes to the conclusion that only a revitalized Christianity can build a new type of civilization, one that is worth saving. Henry P. Van Dusen writes more explicitly on missions in *For the Healing of the Nations*

(Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, $1.00). This is probably the finest popular treatment of world-wide Christianity which has appeared in recent years, being based on a travel-log to the missions of the Pacific area and concluding with the findings of the Madras Conference. The 'younger churches' stand out as the hope of the world, even though they are small, weak, and not yet too stable in their native lands. To read this book is a thrilling experience. Also dealing with the contemporary scene in competent fashion are Reinhold Niebuhr's dynamic *Christianity and Power Politics* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940, $2.00), in which he gives us many occasional essays which are significant for these times; William Ernest Hocking's *Living Religions and a World Faith* (Macmillan Co., 1940, $2.50), which is a philosopher's statement of the importance of Christianity measured against the background of *Rethinking Missions*; Douglas Clyde Macintosh's *Social Religion* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), which combines amazing insight into the social implications of the gospels with concrete suggestions for application of Christian principles to the American and world scenes. No one can afford to miss any of these books if he is to comprehend the American Christian point of view to-day, and that point of view is extremely important in the light of world events.

This does not exhaust the list of significant American books. Charles Clayton Morrison's *What Is Christianity?* (Willett, Clark & Co., 1940, $3.00) is a startling and provocative volume which will be an important reference for some years to come. It finds the meaning of Christianity in the continuing Christian community, and *only* in the church is there to be found the living Christ. Christians are bound to seek the restoration of the Body of Christ. For quick surveys of contemporary theology, there are several fine books, including *American Philosophies of Religion,* by Henry Nelson Wieman and Bernard Eugene Meland (Willett, Clark & Co., 1936, $3.00), *Contemporary English Theology* and *Contemporary Continental Theology,* by Walter Marshall Horton (Harper and Brothers, $2.00 each), and *Present Theological Tendencies,* by Edwin E. Aubrey (Harper and Brothers, 1936, $2.00). Just published is John C. Bennett's *Christian Realism* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941, $2.00), which is a profound treatment of the major themes of theology against the background of a crumbling civilization. This list is far from complete, but any library containing these volumes would represent a fair picture of the best American scholarship in these fields and the books would be eminently readable.

For critical reviews of *some* of these books by the writer of this article, the following references are appended:

Macintosh: *Problem of Religious Knowledge,* in *Review of Religion,* May 1941.

Bosley: *Quest for Religious Certainty,* in *The Chronicle* (unsigned), September 1939.

Baillie: *Our Knowledge of God,* in *Anglican Theological Review,* April 1940.

Temple: *Nature, Man and God,* in *Journal of Religion,* January 1939, and *The Chronicle,* February 1941.
Wieman and Horton: *The Growth of Religion,* in *The Churchman,* December 1st, 1938.
Wieman and Wieman: *The Normative Psychology of Religion,* in *The Modern Churchman,* March 1937.
Bixler, ed., *The Nature of Religious Experience,* in *The Review of Religion,* May 1938, and *The Modern Churchman,* January 1939.
MacCown: *The Search for the Real Jesus,* in *The Review of Religion,* March 1941.
Parsons: *The Religion of the New Testament,* in *The Chronicle,* December 1939.
Major, Manson, Wright: *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* in *The Review of Religion,* March 1939.
Cadbury: *Peril of Modernizing Jesus,* in *The Review of Religion,* March 1939, in *The Modern Churchman,* November 1939.
Macintosh: *Social Religion,* in *The Chronicle* (unsigned), October 1939.
Wieman and Meland: *American Philosophies of Religion,* in *The Modern Churchman,* February 1937.
Horton: *Contemporary English Theology,* in *The Modern Churchman,* February 1938.
Horton: *Contemporary Continental Theology,* in *Christian Century, October* 5th, 1938.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

PARSONS IN A COUNTRY PARISH.

Sir,

I was interested in your reply to Mr. Grime's letter in the current number of the *Modern Churchman.* He appears to be more concerned with the Parson (and the Church) than with the Parish. Neither does he appear to realise that the influence of a good Rector lasts long after he has left the parish.

During the last 42 years I have been in this village, there have been six rectors, including the present one, but the only one whose influence still exists (bar the present one) is one who left sixteen years ago after an incumbency of eighteen years.

He had a very small congregation, preached dismal sermons, and thought he was a failure; forgetting that what counted, was not what he said in church, but his behaviour the remaining six days a week. His influence was felt in every cottage (church and chapel); when he revisited the village for one week-end after an interval of five years, the church was packed, and when he died just before the outbreak of this war, everyone felt (particularly the Non-conformists) that he had lost a friend.

His predecessor, a married man in his thirties, made a point of moving frequently as Mr. Grimes suggests; while his successor was only here for five years before he died; but the influence of both these on the parish is non-existent.

This parish has on the whole been very fortunate with the 43 rectors it has had since 1220 (there were three in the year of the Black Death, 1349), and the majority of them can be described by the following note

written in the register after the funeral:

'February 11th 1728. The Rev. Mr. Rowland Oakley, a pastor of good learning and exemplary probity, rector of this parish, and a most vigilant and faithful pastor in ye same for ye space of 34 years. Aged 63 years.'

W. G. COATES.

The Timbered House,
South Kilworth, Rugby.
Sept. 26th, 1941.

SIR, THE CZECH BRETHREN AND THE KRALICE BIBLE.

I have read with great interest and pleasure Dr. C. J. Wright's masterly and inspiring article on Comenius. May I add a short note on the Kralice Bible, in case your readers are not well acquainted with its origin and character?

The Bible of Kralice (a town in North Bohemia) is one of the notable productions of the Czech Brethren. The way to this edition was prepared by Brother Jan Blahoslav (b. 1523), who at the earnest request of the Council of the Brethren brought out a translation of the New Testament from Greek into Czech in 1564. Then in 1567, a Committee of the Brethren, headed by Ondrey Stefan, a pupil of Blahoslav, set to work to produce a translation of the Bible in six parts. Their labours were lightened by the appearance of the Antwerp Polyglott in four languages (1568—1572). The first part appeared in 1579, parts 2—5 in 1580-88, and the sixth part, containing the New Testament, in 1593-94. There was a second edition in 1596, in one volume. The New Testament was reprinted in a revised version in 1601.

It would be difficult to give a detailed description of the character of these translations, but one example may indicate the general standpoint of the Brethren. In the Council of 1598, a Polish elder, S. T. Turnovsky, reproached the Brethren for their notes and glosses in the 1594, or it may be in the 1596 edition. He quotes a gloss on Mt. xxvi, 26, which he characterizes as thoroughly Taborite or Calvinistic. The words 'This is my Body,' are explained as symbolic, in the same way as St. Paul says in I Cor. x, 4, 'That Rock was Christ.'

The last edition of the Kralice Bible was published in 1613, seven years before the disastrous defeat of the Protestant Czechs at the battle of the White Hill in 1620.

L. PATTERSON.

St. George's,
Campden Hill.
October 7th, 1941.

CROCKFORD'S CLERICAL DIRECTORY 1942 SUPPLEMENT.

SIR,

Owing to conditions brought about by the war, a complete issue of Crockford's Clerical Directory will not be produced in 1942. In its place a Supplement to the 1941 edition is being prepared for publication early in the new year. This will consist of a recording of Appointments, Ordinations, Resignations and Deaths that the editor knows have taken place during 1941, other than those noted in the volume for this year.

To render this Supplement as full as possible, the editor will welcome advice from any clergyman who has effected a change of office since the end of last March of which he has not previously been informed.

THE EDITOR OF CROCKFORD.

A REVISED BAPTISMAL SERVICE.

SIR,

I am very interested in your Baptismal Service in the *Modern Churchman* of September 15. I always think that the Prayer Book is at its very worst in the Baptismal Service. It is a Service, so to speak, frequented by some of the most uneducated people, and yet instead of its language being simple — as yours is — it is highly technical, and requires Biblical and Theological knowledge to be able to begin to understand it. Furthermore, to encourage people to promise something in the name of a helpless infant, is definitely immoral! To tell anyone in later years that he or she must do something promised in his or her name during helpless infancy is absurd! So I welcome greatly your simple, straightforward, honest form of Service.

I have, however, one criticism — and I notice you welcome criticisms. I do not like the sentence:

> 'and that when he has reached years of discretion, he be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed, and so become a full member of the Church to which he has now been admitted.'

Episcopal Confirmation is the normal way of becoming a full member of the Church of England. But Baptism is not a matter of admission to the Church of England, it is the way of admission into the Catholic or Universal Church: and Episcopal Confirmation is not by any means universal throughout the whole Church.

I had this matter brought to my attention a while ago by a friend of mine, who asked me to baptize her child, but said quite frankly that she intended to bring it up in the Presbyterian Church, and in the circumstances, what did I feel about it? My answer was, and would be the same to-day, that I was quite ready to baptize the child, since Baptism was not a matter of admission into one particular branch of the Church, but into the Universal Church. So you see why I want a modification in your Form for Baptism. If I might make a suggestion, I would change the words to:

> 'You are to take care that this child be taught to practise Private Prayer and to attend Public Worship, so that when he has reached years of discretion, he may be advanced to full membership of the Church, and take his place at the Lord's Table.'

G. F. HANDEL ELVEY.

[This is an important proposal and demands serious attention.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

I hasten to thank you for the proposed form of Service of Infant Baptism published in the September number of the *Modern Churchman*. It possesses the simplicity which I have sought during many years. As you invite suggestions I append one or two matters of detail.

(1) I agree that a simple address is advisable, but I would suggest the printing of some preface which parents might read when considering the baptism of their child. The 'Grey' Book, partly followed by the revisers of 1928, has such a preface, which I should modify and shorten somewhat as follows:

> 'Beloved in Christ Jesus, we are taught in Holy Scripture that God willeth all men to be saved, for God is love; and in our Saviour, Jesus Christ, he has revealed the true life.
>
> It is plain that human nature, as we see it in ourselves and in the whole race of mankind, is not what God our Father intended it to be. Neither are we able to save ourselves without God's aid; but of His

bounteous mercy he imparts this life to us by his Spirit in the fellowship of the Church.

And that our Saviour gladly receives little children is declared in the Gospel: so we believe that it is according to his will that they should be admitted members to his Church in Holy Baptism, and receive power to live as sons of God and in all things grow up into him who is our head, even Christ.'

(2) Does not the address to the godparents need the addition of a short clause after 'to acknowledge him a child of God'? *e.g.* insert 'to seek for him the blessings promised to him by his heavenly Father', concluding as in the proposed form.

(3) Add to third answer (after 'I will') 'God being my helper.'

(4) In the words of baptizing I prefer the present form. Why 'into' in one place, and 'in' in another, when the Greek words seem to be used indifferently in *Acts*?

(5) On p. 283 omit 'ever looking on you with love and reverence'; or make quite secondary by inserting them later.

(6) Add a prayer for the home as suggested by the revisers of 1928: 'Our heavenly Father, whose blessed Son did share the life of an earthly home; Bless, we pray thee, the home of this child, and grant wisdom and understanding to all who have the care of him; through the same, thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.'

DENTON C. GREEN.

Killiney Rectory,
Co. Dublin.
Michaelmas Day, 1941.

[We are grateful to Canon Green and offer the following comments: (1) As there are three doctrines of the Baptism current in the Church of England, it would be extremely difficult to produce the Preface he desires without narrowing our Church's comprehensiveness. It seems better therefore to leave the exposition of the Baptismal rite to the officiating minister. The delivery of a booklet on the meaning of Baptism before or after the ceremony to parents and sponsors has much to commend it. (2) We favour the insertion of a clause 'to seek for *him* the blessings of *his* Heavenly Father.' (3) We favour the uniform answer, 'Iwill', to all these questions. (4) Whilst it is true that *eis* and *en* are often used as equivalents in the Greek Testament, we followed the usage of the Revised Version in *Mt.* XXVIII, 19, and of the Authorised Version in 1 *Cor.* I, 13 and 15; but we offer no objection to the consistency demanded by Canon Green. (5) We prefer no change. (6) We heartily agree to the proposal to add a prayer for the home].

H.D.A.M. and R.D.R.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH.

SIR,

Archdeacon Rigg's paper in your September issue on 'Problems of Truth Speaking' reminds me that, in the lectures (by, if my memory is correct, Dean Rashdall) on Moral Philosophy which I attended as an undergraduate at Oxford, the instruction on such questions was the clear and simple one that where moral obligations conflict, the lower must give place to the higher, the obligation to tell the truth must therefore, in case of conflict, yield to the obligation to save life (the person posed with the situation having to face it in its entirety, and not leave one-half of it to God, which would be an evasion of responsibility in the particular circum-

stances); the only categorical imperative being 'Do the right,' involving of course a burden of decision sometimes extremely heavy but not infringing the divine prerogative. What I am unable to follow in the paper is the difficulties posited in the case of the expectant mother lying dangerously ill. To tell her an untruth about a dying daughter in the next room is surely a course of conduct which would be almost universally approved. One cannot believe that, in actual life, the wife's confidence, or that of friends, in the husband's veracity would be in the least shaken, or that the same course could never be repeated in similar circumstances. Surely all, except those with a very mechanical attitude towards truth-speaking, would comment with one accord, 'But of course, what else could you have done?'

By the way, is not the word 'prove' wrongly used in the penultimate paragraph? I have always been taught that 'Exceptions prove the rule' means that they test it, *i.e.* if there are exceptions, it is clear the rule is not universal. Prove often has this meaning in Scripture.

D. G. DAVIES.

Bletchington Rectory,
Oxford.
October 1, 1941.

SIR,

THE TRUTH ABOUT SPIRITUALISM.

The well-known statement of Myers, cited by Dr. Rendall, demands critical examination.

> 'I venture on a bold saying: for I predict that in consequence of new evidence, all reasonable men, a century hence, will believe in the Resurrection of Christ, whereas in default of the evidence, no reasonable man, a century hence, would have believed.'

What is meant precisely by the Resurrection of Christ in this passage? Does it mean belief in the Empty Tomb and the transmutation of Christ's natural body into a spiritual body?

If it does, psychical research is not going to help us here, for it is unable to prove the occurrence of such miracles. If it means, however, that Christ manifested Himself after His crucifixion to His disciples in the same manner as the departed to-day are alleged to manifest themselves in those cases attested by psychical research, we doubt whether this will provide for those who accept such evidence anything at all equivalent to the Christian faith in the resurrection of our Lord. The Christian faith in the resurrection of Christ is based upon what His disciples believed Him to be. Had they not first believed in Him they would never have been led to believe in His resurrection. Their second proof of His resurrection was the gift of His spiritual presence — the Holy Spirit — to His disciples in the Pentecostal outpouring. Their third reason — first in the order of time — was their belief that God, the almighty and the all righteous, had provided a future life for all those who were loyal to Him and had had communion with Him in this present life.

None of these three proofs of the Resurrection of Christ rest upon the phenomena attested by psychical research, and were its findings non-existent these three proofs would be quite unaffected. If this be so, Myers' statement indicates a misconception of the real proofs of the resurrection and so his conclusion is not valid.

May I recall that Baron von Hügel maintained 'that the vogue of Spiritualism was due to the decline of the mystical element in the Churches.'

K. M. CLUTTON.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL COMMITTEE AND THE REPORT ON CHRISTIAN PEACE AIMS IN *THE WAY*.

SIR,

Mr. Victor Fisher has of course every right to criticise the Report on Christian Peace Aims published in the July issue of *The Way*. But it is unfortunate that he should have made such a serious misstatement as to refer to the publication of the Report as a 'manoeuvre which seeks to convert the Modern Churchmen's Union into an agency for pushing proposals of a partisan political organisation' — referring to the *New Commonwealth Institute of World Affairs*. This organisation (unlike the *New Commonwealth Society*, which is avowedly a propagandist body) has been at great pains to remain a Research Institute and is not in the technical sense a political organisation, still less a partisan one. Even if it had been, it is hard to see how the publication of the Report could have been justly described as a manoeuvre to make the M.C.U. an agency for pushing its proposals. Only one member of the Commission of five appointed (*nem. con.*) by the M.C.U. Council was an officer of the Institute; three of the other four and the two co-optees (all of whom have expressed their general approval of the Report) are members of the M.C.U. Council, and the other is a frequent contributor to your pages. The work of the Commission, although countless changes were made in the earlier drafts, proceeded most smoothly and I think all the writers of the preliminary drafts said that they thought that they had been much improved by the criticism of other members of the Commission.

I will leave your readers to judge the appositeness of the adjectives Mr. Fisher applies to the earlier sections of the Report. It seems strange that he should speak of Part III's 'socialistic clichés and stock phrases of Marxism' when it contains many warnings against a thorough-going state-socialism and such sentences as: 'It is the extreme Marxists (and Nazis) who have most betrayed freedom.' But it is when he discusses p. 46 that Mr. Fisher is most unfair; the tentative statement that it 'might be better . . .' he interprets as being a matter of the author's (*sic*) 'proceeding' . . . 'to join South Germany to a Danubian *bloc*.' Although the proposals in this paragraph are explicitly stated to be 'provisional only' and are clearly secondary to the more important general proposals of the preceding paragraphs, and although the Editorial states that 'no member of the Commission should be taken as bound by every sentence in the Report,' Mr. Fisher asserts that the 'authors of the Report blithely declare their *determination* (my italics) to divide Europe along their own fanciful lines.'

I certainly do not consider myself as bound by these tentative proposals; but they happen to have the approval of professional students of international affairs of high academic standing; and I should have thought that they were less definitely stated and that they occupy a smaller proportion of the Report than the M.C.U. Council might reasonably have expected when it appointed a Commission to report on *Peace Aims*.

No doubt the Report is full of imperfections; but it is remarkable how few members of the Union have complied with the editorial request that they should point them out. It is of course impossible that all members of the Union should agree with any such proposals, however tentative, and for that reason presumably the Council has decided that 'the freedom of the M.C.U. be safeguarded by the Council not being required to revise, commend, approve, or disapprove such reports officially.' A clear statement to this effect was therefore put at the head of the Report. But the

Council remains faced with the obligation to implement Aim VII, and, rightly or wrongly, it has shown that in its opinion questions of 'the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life' which may arouse some controversy and require greater technical knowledge and more free time than is possessed by the average member of the Council are best left to small Commissions, with a strictly limited power to co-opt.

H. P. KINGDON,
Secretary of the Commission.

Exeter College, Oxford.
October 30th, 1941.

SIR,

In your September issue, you include a letter from a correspondent who discusses the M.C.U. Report on Christian Peace Aims. With a number of its observations, which appear to me to be expressed in terms which are rather more rhetorical than convincing, I am not competent to deal, but it is necessary, I think, to contradict two mis-statements of fact which are included in it, and which a closer acquaintance with the matter under discussion would have prevented. Your correspondent observes that it would have been better if the Commission which prepared the Report had done so 'as the avowed instrument of that organization which has obviously inspired the main content of the Report, i.*e.* The New Commonwealth Institute of World Affairs,' and your correspondent then protests against a monoeuvre 'which seeks to convert the Modern Churchmen's Union into an agency for pushing proposals of a partisan political organization.'

The Institute, of which I am Director, has certainly not inspired the main content of the Report. Moreover, it is not, and never has been, a partisan political organization. I fear your correspondent is mistaking us for some other body. We exist for the purposes of discussion and research, and we have no political programme of any kind. It is a matter for regret that your correspondent is unfamiliar with organizations of such a character.

G. W. KEETON
(Director, The New Commonwealth Institute).

Barrows,
Roydon, near Ware.

SIR,

I am obliged to you for giving me the opportunity of replying promptly to the apologetics and explanations of Messrs. Kingdon and Keeton regarding my indictment in your September issue of the Report on Christian Peace Aims published in the July issue of *The Way*.

These gentlemen assure your readers that the New Commonwealth Institute of World Affairs has nothing whatever to do with the New Commonwealth Society. The former, we are told, is a 'research institute and is not *in the technical sense* a political organisation,' whereas, says Mr. Kingdon, 'the New Commonwealth Society is avowedly a propagandist body.' What a pity that two organisations with such different aims and methods should have such similar titles! Nor is it unknown for people sharing the same views to split into nominally separate movements, pursuing the same end by different methods.

Some of us do not forget that during and after the last world-conflict various agitations were carried on which enabled the Germans to win the peace although they had lost the war. Now we hear similar chords being

struck. Let me quote from the Kingdon Report (p. 46) :

> 'Germany must certainly be allowed never again the free control of military power . . . On the other hand . . . it would be unwise to punish the Germans to any greater extent . . . or breed in them a sense of grievance . . . '

Germany has made Europe a shambles. Murder on a colossal scale has been systematically carried out. Neither age nor sex has been spared. Cities have been blasted into ruins. Every form of human culture has been ruthlessly assailed, and every law of God and man violated. Yet, amid such unprecedented horrors, the Report of Mr. Kingdon and his colleagues expresses primary concern that the Germans should not have bred in them a sense of grievance. I have never come across a more monstrous reversal of every human canon of justice or one more contrary to British opinion and sentiment. It is in the last degree unfortunate that such declarations should ever have been allowed to appear in an official publication of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

No greater disservice could be done to the Church than to ally it to any one political movement. Certainly no greater blow could be inflicted on the M.C.U. If Mr. Kingdon and his friends feel ardently on the subject, they are quite at liberty to join their chosen movement. Do not let them imagine, however, that they can capture the M.C.U. for that purpose. It was brought into existence with different objects. Those objects have been maintained with wisdom and self-sacrifice by a body of distinguished scholars. We will not have the Union diverted from its great work or brought to disunion by those who seek to use it for purposes for which its corporate membership is not adapted.

For the rest, I have only to add that those members of the Union who wish to enlarge their knowledge on economics and sociology, in view of inevitable post-war readjustments, can choose from a wide field of authorities far more impartial and responsible than Mr. Kingdon's amateur Commission.

F. Victor Fisher.

26 Buckland Crescent,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
4th November, 1941.

Sir,

POPULAR DIVINITY LECTURES FOR PARISHES.

A Divinity Course was recently held at New College and you were good enough to print a very generous appreciation of it written by the Headmaster of Sherborne School. Your readers may like to see a syllabus of this course. I shall be glad to send a copy to any enquirer. It is intended to hold a similar course next August (3rd to 8th), but any one or more of the lectures can be delivered in other places. There is no fee either for the Oxford course or for lectures given elsewhere, but a contribution towards travelling expenses will be required where these are considerable.

R. B. Henderson,
Manchester Reader in Religious Education.

New College,
Oxford.
October 21st, 1941.

CORRIGENDUM.

Page 195, line 5 from top: Read *Vale of Soul-making* for *Veil of Soul-making*.